

**REMARKS**

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-7, 19-26, and 38-40 are original. Claims 8-18, 27-37, and 41-44 were previously canceled without prejudice. Claims 1-7, 19-26, and 38-40 are pending.

**The §102 Rejections**

Claims 1-5, 19-23, and 38-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,487,406 to Chang et al. ("Chang").

**The §103 Rejections**

Claims 6-7 and 24-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,073,016 to Hulthen et al. ("Hulthen").

Applicant submits that the Office has failed to establish that Chang discloses each and every element of Claims 1-5, 19-23, and 38-40 and a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting Claims 6-7 and 24-25. Before discussing the substance of the Office's rejections, however, sections entitled "The §102 Standard" and "The §103 Standard" are provided and will be used in addressing the Office's rejections. Following this section, a section entitled "The Chang Reference" is provided and describes Chang's disclosure, after which Applicant addresses the Office's grounds for rejecting the pending claims.

1        The §102 Standard

2        Anticipation is a legal term of art. Applicant notes that in order to provide a  
3        valid finding of anticipation, several conditions must be met: (i) the reference must  
4        include each and every element as set forth in the claim (*Verdegaal Bros. v. Union*  
5        *Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987);  
6        and see MPEP §2131); and (ii) the teachings of the reference cannot be modified  
7        (see MPEP §706.02, stating that "No question of obviousness is present" in  
8        conjunction with anticipation).

9  
10       The §103 Standard

11       To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria *must* be  
12       met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references  
13       themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the  
14       art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. *In re Jones*, 958  
15       F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5  
16       USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of  
17       success. *In re Merck & Co., Inc.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).  
18       Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or  
19       suggest all the claim limitations. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580  
20       (CCPA 1974).

21       Hence, when patentability turns on the question of obviousness, the search  
22       for and analysis of the prior art includes evidence relevant to the finding of  
23       whether there is a teaching, motivation, or suggestion to select and combine or  
24       modify the references relied on as evidence of obviousness. The need for  
25       specificity pervades this authority. See, e.g., *In re Kotzab*, 217 F.3d 1365, 1371, 55

1 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000) ("particular findings must be made as to the  
2 reason the skilled artisan, with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would have  
3 selected these components for combination in the manner claimed").

#### 4 5 The Chang Reference

6 Generally, Chang discloses a method and system for providing seamless  
7 mobile IP connectivity between mobile stations (MS) connected to a PCS network  
8 via base stations (BS) connected to base station switching centers (BSCs). Each  
9 MS is assigned a permanent IP address and associated with a home subnet. When  
10 the system detects that the MS is connected to a BSC outside of its home subnet,  
11 the MS is assigned a care-of address (COA) to which IP data can be forwarded. IP  
12 data from the MS is routed through a gateway router (GR). IP data directed to the  
13 MS is directed to the MS's permanent IP address. If the MS is connected to a BSC  
14 outside of its home subnet, the data traffic is forwarded to the MS's care-of  
15 address. In sum, Chang discloses providing a temporary IP address to a mobile  
16 system when out of its home subnet and then routing data from the mobile  
17 system's permanent IP address to its temporary address. *See Chang, at Abstract.*

#### 18 19 Argument

20 Applicant submits that the Office has failed to establish that Chang  
21 discloses each and every element of Claims 1-5, 19-23, and 38-40.

22 For the Office's convenience, Applicant sets forth the language of  
23 independent Claim 1.

1 Claim 1 recites a method for broadcasting an announcement signal,  
2 comprising:

- 3 ○ broadcasting a network identifier signal that uniquely identifies a  
4 computer network;
- 5 ○ broadcasting an authorizer signal that identifies an authorizer  
6 network address on the computer network, the authorizer network  
7 address being associated with an authorizer that is configured to  
8 authorize mobile clients to utilize the computer network; and
- 9 ○ broadcasting a verifier signal that identifies a verifier network  
10 address on the computer network, the verifier network address being  
11 associated with a verifier that is configured to verify data packets  
12 sent by mobile clients utilizing the computer network.

13  
14 The Chang reference has not been shown to disclose each and every  
15 element as set forth in Claim 1 as required by *Verdegaal Bros.*

16 For the Office's convenience, the Office's argument that Chang discloses  
17 the elements of Claim 1 is:

18 As per claim 1, Chang et al teach a method for broadcasting  
19 an announcement signal, comprising:

20 broadcasting a network identifier signal that uniquely  
21 identifies a computer network (column 5, lines 40-60 and column  
22 7, lines 7-17);

23 broadcasting an authorizer signal that identifies an  
24 authorizer network address on the computer network, the  
25 authorizer network address being associated with an authorizer that  
is configured to authorize mobile clients to utilize the computer  
network (column 5, lines 40-60 and column 7, lines 7-17); and

broadcasting a verifier signal that identifies a verifier  
network address on the computer network, the verifier network  
address being associated with a verifier that is configured to verify  
data packets sent by mobile clients utilizing the computer network  
(column 7, lines 7-17 and column 28-30).

*Office Action, paragraph 4.*

1 Chang does not have columns 28-30. For this reason, Applicant assumes  
2 that the Office meant "lines 28-30" for column 7, rather than "column 28-30" as  
3 recited above. The portions of Chang assumed to be relied on by the Office to  
4 reject Claim 1 are:

5  
6 In operation, system information broadcast by the PCS  
7 network and received by each MS 18 includes a PCS registration  
8 area identification and a BS identification. Therefore, according to  
9 one aspect of the invention, when an MS 18 moves from one BS 16  
10 to another, the MS 18 uses the data in the system information  
11 broadcast to determine if it has crossed a PCS registration area or  
12 not, and whether a PCS registration procedure must be performed. It  
13 can be appreciated that frequent transmission of Mobile IP  
14 registration parameters, such as a subnet mask, Agent  
15 Advertisement, etc., may consume a large quantity of system  
16 information bandwidth. According to a further aspect of the  
17 invention, Mobile IP registration parameters are instead conveyed to  
18 an MS 18 when a BSC 14 determines that an MS 18 has moved  
19 between different subnets. Thus, the information is transmitted to the  
20 MS only when it is specifically needed. Various MS registration  
21 scenarios will now be discussed with further reference to the  
22 example network configuration illustrated in FIG. 3 and the flow  
23 diagrams of FIGS. 4 and 5.

16 *Chang, column 5, lines 40-60.*

18 Upon receiving the Agent Advertisement, the MS sends a  
19 datagram (a Mobile IP Registration Request message) to the BSC  
20 directed to the MS's HA. The datagram is a conventional LAN  
21 registration message and includes the information provided to the  
22 MS in the BSC's agent advertisement, (e.g., the IP addresses of the  
23 MS, FA, HA, COA, and the lifetime). Upon receiving the datagram,  
24 the BSC does not interpret the message, but instead forwards it to the  
25 present subnet's FA. The FA determines the MS's HA and forwards  
the Mobile IP Registration Request message to the HA via one or  
more GRs and possibly the Internet.

Upon receiving the registration datagram, the HA  
authenticates the MS. If the MS has just moved out of its home

1 subnet and into a foreign subnet, the HA sends a Gratuitous ARP to  
2 all other nodes in the HA's subnet instructing them to associate the  
3 HA's hardware address with the MS's IP address so that datagrams  
4 destined for the MS may be intercepted by the HA and forwarded  
5 appropriately.

6 *Chang, column 7, lines 7-17 and 28-34 (lines 31-34 for context).*

7 Preliminarily, the Office's rejection does not address with legally sufficient  
8 specificity why Chang anticipates Claim 1. Instead, the Office simply repeats  
9 language of Claim 1 followed by reference to a portion of Chang. For this reason  
10 alone, the Office has not met its burden to show that each and every element of  
11 Claim 1 is anticipated by Chang.

12 Also, this lack of specificity necessitates that Applicant argue against what  
13 Applicant can only assume are the Office's arguments based on the portions cited  
14 in the Action. As such, the following arguments are provided *arguendo* based on  
15 Applicant's best assumptions.

16 The Office seems to rely on Chang's Agent Advertisement as disclosing the  
17 claimed "authorizer signal" and that it "identifies an authorizer network address on  
18 the computer network." Chang's Agent Advertisement "generally includes data  
19 identifying the FA [Foreign Agent] of the new subnet, such as the FA's source  
20 address and a COA [care-of address] to be used to direct data to the new FA."  
21 *Chang, column 6, line 65 to column 7, line 6.* And thus, the Office seems also to  
22 rely on Chang's Foreign Agent's source address being associated with the Foreign  
23 Agent to disclose "the authorizer network address being associated with an  
24 authorizer that is configured to authorize mobile clients to utilize the computer  
25 network" as required by Claim 1.

1 Chang's Foreign Agent does not disclose "an authorizer that is configured  
2 to authorize mobile clients to utilize the computer network" as required by Claim  
3 1. Chang's Foreign Agent does not authorize Chang's mobile system to utilize the  
4 computer network, it instead "determines the MS=s HA", which perhaps the  
5 Office is confusing with "authorizing mobile clients to utilize the computer  
6 network". Other than that, Chang's Foreign Agent acts to transfer packets to the  
7 mobile system's temporary IP address, not "authorize" Chang's mobile system to  
8 utilize a computer network.

9 The Office seems to rely on Chang's mobile system (MS) sending a  
10 datagram to the base station switching center (BSC) that is directed to the MS's  
11 Home Agent as anticipating part of Claim 1. *See Chang column 7, lines 7-17 and*  
12 *28-30.* Chang discloses that his mobile system sends a datagram to the BSC and  
13 that the BSC forwards it to the present subnet's FA, after which the FA forwards  
14 to the HA. Chang also discloses that, on receiving the datagram from the FA, the  
15 HA authenticates the MS. *Id.*

16 Claim 1, however, recites "broadcasting a verifier signal that identifies a  
17 verifier network address on the computer network, the verifier network address  
18 being associated with a verifier that is configured to verify data packets sent by  
19 mobile clients utilizing the computer network." Claim 1 requires broadcasting the  
20 verifier signal and the authorizer signal as part of "an announcement signal." But  
21 Chang discloses different signals coming from different sources. Chang's Agent  
22 Advertisement signal message is sent from the BSC to the MS. *Chang, column 6,*  
23 *line 65 to column 7, line 6.* Chang's datagram, on which the Office seems to rely,  
24 is sent by Chang's mobile system to the BSC. *Chang, column 7, lines 7-17 and*  
25 *28-30.* If Chang's BSC broadcasts one message to the MS and the MS broadcasts

1 another to the BSC, then these two messages cannot be part of "an announcement  
2 signal" as required by Claim 1.

3 For at least these reasons, the Office has not shown that each and every  
4 element of Claim 1 is anticipated by Chang.

5 Claims 2-5 depend from Claim 1 and are allowable as depending from an  
6 allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited  
7 features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 1, are neither disclosed  
8 nor suggested in references of record, either singly or in combination with one  
9 another.

10 The Office's argument for rejecting Claims 6-7 under 103 does not correct  
11 the Office's deficiencies in its rejection of Claim 1, on which Claims 6-7 depend.  
12 For at least this reason, Claims 6-7 are allowable as depending from an allowable  
13 base claim. Claims 6-7 are also allowable for their own recited features that, in  
14 combination with those recited in Claim 1, are neither disclosed nor suggested in  
15 references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.



1 *Claims 19-26*

2 For the Office's convenience, Applicant sets forth the language of  
3 independent Claim 19.

4 Claim 19 recites one or more computer-readable media containing  
5 computer-executable instructions that, when executed on a computer, perform the  
following steps:

- 6 ○ transmitting a network identifier signal that identifies an associated  
network;
- 7 ○ transmitting an authorizer signal that identifies an authorizer on the  
8 network, the authorizer being configured to authorize client access to  
the network; and
- 9 ○ transmitting a verifier signal that identifies a verifier, the verifier  
10 being configured to verify that data packets transmitted to the  
network are transmitted from clients that have been authorized to  
11 access the network.

12 Applicant submits that the Chang reference has not been shown to disclose  
13 each and every element as set forth in Claim 19 as required by *Verdegaal Bros.*

14 For the Office's convenience, the Office's argument that Chang discloses  
15 the elements of Claim 19 is:

16  
17 As per claims 19-23, these claims contain similar limitations as  
18 claims 1-5 above, therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

19 *Office Action, paragraph 9.*

20  
21 The portions of Chang assumed to be relied on by the Office to reject Claim  
22 1 are set forth for Claim 1 above.

23 For at least the reasons set forth in the argument relating to Claim 1 above,  
24 the Office has not shown that each and every element of Claim 19 is anticipated by  
25 Chang.

1 Claims 20-23 depend from Claim 19 and are allowable as depending from  
2 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited  
3 features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 19, are neither disclosed  
4 nor suggested in references of record, either singly or in combination with one  
5 another.

6 The Office's argument for rejecting Claims 24-26 under 103 does not  
7 correct the Office's deficiencies in its rejection of Claim 19, on which Claims 24-  
8 26 depend. For at least this reason, Claims 24-26 are allowable as depending from  
9 an allowable base claim. Claims 24-26 are also allowable for their own recited  
10 features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 19, are neither disclosed  
11 nor suggested in references of record, either singly or in combination with one  
12 another.

13  
14 *Claims 38-40*

15 For the Office's convenience, Applicant sets forth the language of  
16 independent Claim 38.

17 Claim 38 recites a system, comprising:

- 18 ○ a network identifier;
- 19 ○ an authorizer identifier;
- 20 ○ a verifier identifier;
- 21 ○ a signal generator configured to generate a signal that communicates  
the network identifier, the authorizer identifier and the verifier  
22 identifier.

23 The Chang reference has not been shown to disclose each and every  
24 element as set forth in Claim 38 as required by *Verdegaal Bros.*  
25

1 For the Office's convenience, the Office's argument that Chang discloses  
2 the elements of Claim 38 is:

3  
4 As per claim 38, Chang et al teach a system, comprising:  
5 a network identifier; an authorizer identifier; a verifier identifier  
6 (column 7, lines 10-15 and column 5, lines 40-60);  
7 a signal generator configured to generate a signal that  
8 communicates the network identifier, the authorizer identifier and  
9 the verifier identifier (column 5, lines 40-55 and column 8, lines  
10 40-55).

11 *Office Action, paragraph 10.*

12 As set forth in the argument for Claim 1 above, Chang does not disclose an  
13 authorizer identifier. For at least this reason, the Office has not shown that each  
14 and every element of Claim 38 is anticipated by Chang.

15 Claims 39-40 depend from Claim 38 and are allowable as depending from  
16 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited  
17 features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 38, are neither disclosed  
18 nor suggested in references of record, either singly or in combination with one  
19 another.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 **Conclusion**

2 Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims are in condition for  
3 allowance.

4  
5 Respectfully Submitted,

6 Date: 14 Sep 05

7 By: Michael K. Colby  
8 Michael K. Colby  
9 Reg. No. 45,816  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25